



\$~23 & 24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 951/2022**

CHITRANGAD RAO

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Dewan, Mr. Raunak Gupta,
Hema Tuli, Advs.

versus

BANK OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Arora, Mr. Niraj Kumar,
Mr. Sourabh Mahla, Mr. Om Prakash,
Advs.

24

+ **W.P.(C) 15365/2004 CM APPL. 11172/2004 CM APPL. 8308/2016**

BANK OF INDIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Arora, Mr. Niraj Kumar,
Mr. Sourabh Mahla, Mr. Om Prakash,
Advs.

versus

CHITRANGAD RAO

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajiv Dewan, Mr. Raunak Gupta,
Hema Tuli, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

16.04.2025

1. Counsel for respondent states that the reply has been filed back in December 2022.
2. In paragraph 10 of the said reply, they have stated that payments of Rs.10,07,713.55/- have been made to petitioner till July 2022. The petitioner



admittedly superannuated in July 2022.

3. Counsel for petitioner, however, states that the Judgment dated 18th October 2005 had directed the respondent to make payment of wages at the higher of the two rates, between the last drawn and the minimum wages, as notified by the Authorities from time to time, w.e.f. 8th June 2004.

4. As per petitioner, the amounts due are tabulated as under:



Period	Wages paid to the Respondent i.e. last drawn wages (in Rs.)	Wages as notified for graduates in clerical and non-technical supervisory staff in all scheduled employments (in Rs.)
01.02.2010	4,690.67	7,020
01.02.2011	4,690.67	8,060
01.04.2011	4,690.67	8,502
01.10.2011	4,690.67	8,814
01.04.2012	4,690.67	9,282
01.10.2012	4,690.67	9,594
01.04.2013	4,690.67	10,218
01.10.2013	4,690.67	10,686
01.04.2014	4,690.67	11,310
01.10.2014	4,690.67	11,414
01.04.2015	4,690.67	11,986
01.10.2015	4,690.67	12,142
01.04.2016	4,690.67	12662
01.10.2016	4,690.67	12870
01.04.2017	4,690.67	13182
01.04.2018	4,690.67	13598
01.10.2018	4,690.67	13728
01.04.2019	4,690.67	19060
01.10.2019	4,690.67	19522
22.10.2019	4,690.67	19572
01.04.2020	4,690.67	20196
01.10.2020	4,690.67	20430
01.04.2021	4,690.67	20976
01.10.2021	4,690.67	21184
Till date		



Interest@6%

Amount due from 01.02.2010 to 31.01.2011 =Rs.27952/-	Rs.20124/-
Amount due from 01.02.2011 to 31.03.2011 =Rs.6739/-	Rs.4848/-
Amount due from 01.04.2011 to 30.09.2011 = Rs.22868/-	Rs.16464/-
Amount due from 01.10.2011 to 31.03.2012 = Rs.27548/-	Rs.16530/-
Amount due from 01.04.2012 to 30.09.2012 = Rs.29420/-	Rs.17650/-
Amount due from 01.10.2012 to 31.03.2013 = Rs.33164/-	Rs.17910/-
Amount due from 01.04.2013 to 30.09.2013 = Rs.35972/-	Rs.19422/-
Amount due from 01.10.2013 to 31.03.2014 = Rs.39716/-	Rs.19064/-
Amount due from 01.04.2014 to 30.09.2014 = Rs.40340/-	Rs.19360/-
Amount due from 01.10.2014 to 31.03.2015 = Rs.43772/-	Rs.18382/-
Amount due from 01.04.2015 to 30.09.2015 = Rs.44708/-	Rs.18774/-
Amount due from 01.10.2015 to 31.03.2016 = Rs.47828/-	Rs.16092/-
Amount due from 01.04.2016 to 30.09.2016 = Rs.49076/-	Rs.17670/-
Amount due from 01.10.2016 to 31.03.2017 = Rs.50948/-	Rs.15285/-
Amount due from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2018 = Rs.101896/-	Rs.24456/-
Amount due from 01.04.2018 to 30.09.2018 = Rs.53444/-	Rs.12828/-
Amount due from 01.10.2018 to 31.03.2019 = Rs.54224/-	Rs.9759/-
Amount due from 01.04.2019 to 30.09.2019 = Rs.86216/-	Rs.15519/-
Amount due from 01.10.2019 to 21.10.2019 = Rs.9010/-	Rs.1623/-
Amount due from 22.10.2019 to 31.03.2020 = Rs.89288/-	Rs.10714/-
Amount due from 01.04.2020 to 30.09.2020 = Rs.93032/-	Rs.11164/-
Amount due from 01.10.2020 to 31.03.2021 = Rs.94436/-	Rs.7555/-
Amount due from 01.04.2021 to 30.09.2021 = Rs.97712/-	Rs.5863/-
Amount due from 01.10.2021 to08.2022 = Rs.204880/-	Rs.12293/-

Total amount due = Rs13,84,189/- Interest@6%
Rs.3,90,785/- Total Amount along with interest @ 6% per
annum Rs.17.74.974/-



5. Counsel for Bank of India contends that any payment under Section 17B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ('**ID Act**'), will be subject to a recovery proceeding under Section 33C(1) of the ID Act, relying on a decision dated 1st April 2011 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **Vimal Kumar v. Ramesh Negi & Anr.**, CONT.CAS.(C) 173/2011.
6. Counsel for petitioner contends that their case is distinguishable considering that a specific order was passed by the Court in this matter and it is not a mere execution of an award under Section 17B of the ID Act.
7. Counsel for respondent seeks some time to take further instructions in the matter and examine it further. They shall place on record the minimum wages as notified by the Authorities, from time to time, for the period the wages are to be paid to petitioner and place them on record in a tabulation.
8. List on 1st September 2025.
9. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 16, 2025/ak/kp